

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 29, 2006, in the nature of a requirement for restriction, has been carefully reviewed. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Restriction has been required among what the Examiner considers to be patentably distinct species of the invention, as follows:

Group I, drawn to an immunoassay or diagnostic assays, presently comprising claims 1-2;

Group II, drawn to methods of purifying, presently comprising claim 3; and

Group III, drawn to methods of producing peptides, presently comprising claims 4 and 5.

Applicant hereby elects Group I, presently comprising claims 1 and 2.

As applicant has elected Group I, applicant is required to elect a single disclosed species of a pathological condition for prosecution on the merits.

Applicant hereby elects autoimmune diseases. Written support for diagnosing autoimmune diseases by the claimed methods can be found in the specification as filed at paragraph 0072 on page 21.

Appln. No. 10/632,929
Amdt. dated July 31, 2006
Reply to Office action of June 29, 2006


If the election requirement is maintained, it will be clear on the record that the PTO considers the groups to be patentably distinct from one another *i.e.*, *prima facie* non-obvious from one another. This means that a reference identical to the one group would not render the other group *prima facie* obvious.

Favorable consideration and examination of all pending claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\I\inl2\Wallach10D\Pto\2006-07-31 Response.doc